DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 737 EA 007 325

AUTHOR Lutz, Frank W., Ed.; Ramsey, Margaret A., Ed.
TITLE Problems in Training and Utilizing Urban Education Leadership.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators (107th, Dallas, Texas, February 21-24, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Administrator Selection; City Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Leadership Training; Minority Groups; *Urban Education; Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

The positions expressed reflect several perspectives on the university-urban district cooperative leadership program carried out by Pennsylvania State University and the Philadelphia school district. The statements are made by students now holding positions as high school assistant principal, elementary principal, elementary assistant principal, administrative assistant to the district superintendent, and special program director. In addition, views of the program are expressed by a person who left the district and later returned, a person who returned and later left, the central offices director of staff leadership, the university program codirectors, and a district superintendent who worked with many of the students while they were interns. All agree on the overall success of the program. There are problems, however: there was a lack of organizational commitment; the program rested on the individual commitments of a few individuals in each organization; and the program did not prepare persons to solve specific problems. (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED107737

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROBLEMS IN TRAINING AND UTILIZING URBAN EDUCATION LEADERSHIP*

Edited by

Frank W. Lutz & Margaret A. Ramsey

The Pennsylvania State University

EA 007 325

*Also presented at A.A.S.A. Convention, 1975

1975

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	University Problems by Margaret A. Ramsey and Frank W. Lutz	1
II.	Selection and Training by Eugene J. Richardson, Jr.	9
III.	Elementary Principal's Prospective by James E. Washington	14
IV.	District Superintendent's Prospective by William Ross, Jr.	18
V.	Another District Superintendent's Prospective by William H. Harris	21
VI.	Alternative Administrator's Prospective by Robert C. Hutchins	28
VII.	Central Office Prospective by Lionel Lauer	33
VIII.	The Insider Looking Out by William L. Garbarina	37
IX.	Summary by Frank W. Lutz	42

University Problems in the Training and Utilization of Urban Education Leadership

By

Margaret A. Ramsey and Frank W. Lutz

Introduction

The nature and degree of problems encountered by a university attempting to assist in the training and utilization of urban education leadership is affected partially by its geography. If the university is part of the urban center it will likely find itself consistently bombarded with requests for assistance to solve urban problems. The university may find itself stepping back in sheer self-defense. That self-defense may well go too far and often urban school districts find it almost impossible to obtain the kind of help they think they need from urban universities that are literally "across the street."

The non-urban university encounters a different problem. Their faculty reads about urban problems but does not often encounter them. As a group their interest is at best "intellectual." In order to get involved they usually must travel long distances at considerable cost, and the few who are willing and want to become involved have a difficult time in convincing their colleagues or the urban school district that their interest is real or worthwhile. In addition, they are critized for spending their time in convincing their colleagues or the urban school district that their interest is real or worthwhile. In addition, they are critized for spending their time in areas not of concern to their "usual clientele." Add to these situations the natural emnity between the "theoretical" orientation of universities and the "practical" nature of urban school districts and the problem of cooperation between urban school districts and universities in the training and utilization of education leadership seems almost insurmountable. Yet it occasionally

occurs. This paper describes our experience at Penn State (a non-urban university) with Philadelphia (an urban school district).

Internal Problems

Universities, like urban school districts, are in financial trouble. On a fiscal basis alone it is reasonable to question the continued existence of either. Neither is in a position to supply their own organizational resources to "bail out" the other. It is only with great difficulty they both can be convinced that they share common problems (meeting the needs of the citizens of the state) and should and must join together (use the resources of each) in a common effort to solve the pressing problems of public education. The development of educational leadership is part of this common problem. But it is unlikely that cooperative programs will occur between urban districts and universities except that such programs can attract outside funds. With grants from federal and private agencies becoming more difficult to obtain these programs become more unlikely.

The first problem the university encounters is how to get funds to attract urban leadership into some type (any type) of program. It is unusual if potential urban-leadership will be attracted to non-urban universities without attractive stipends and tuition grants, not likely to be supplied from normal university or school district resources.

The next problem is one of staffing the program. Faculty salaries must be supplied, again usually from outside sources. It is unlikely that professors will be rewarded by their universities for participation in such "practical" programs either by payment for overload (which they will undoubtedly encounter) or by more rapid promotion or tenure. It is more likely they will be penalized. The keynote to staff participation is, therefore,

individual committment. Professors, like other humans, divide unequally between the committed and the uncommitted, with the statistical difference favoring the uncommitted. Among the committed there are many interests and goals to which one can be committed, urban problems only one among the many. Thus, staff recruitment is difficult.

If these problems are overcome and urban leadership talent is recruited into a competently staffed program (even with relative good stipends) there will be cultural shock for both the students (particularly urban minority members) and the university community (usually white and non-urban oriented).

Adjustment in all of the above areas almost surely requires certain changes in the organization that are or will be perceived as changes in the relative power and status of the parties and programs involved. Such changes will cause problems from the untenured, uninvolved assistant professor all the way up the organizational ladder to the president's office. Given the persistence of the organizational bureaucracy these changes are not likely to advantage the urban programs or their personnel. As these changes start to effect any real or persistent change in the university the going gets rougher. Realistically it is not likely that much permanent change in the university due to funded urban programs will endure beyond the existence of outside funding. Institutional "committment" usually follows rather than proceeds the availability of outside funds, and it seldom outlasts those funds for very long.

External University Problems

The problem of trust and cooperation between universities and urban schools has already been spoken about briefly. An opportunity for either or both to obtain a large outside grant expedites that "trust" enormously.

Even so the initial trust is likely to be an apersonal (one-to-one) basis. One would hope that interpersonal trust, upon which first interactions are likely to be based, will grow toward institutional trust. Given the problems mentioned above, this is unlikely. If someone with organizational rank in the university or college has a close personal relationship with another in the school district who holds organizational rank the opportunity to cooperate is more likely (i.e. the Superintendent of schools and the Dean or department head). The higher the rank the better, for almost certainly some established rules and procedures in both organizations will have to be modified if a successful process of training and utilizing education leadership is to be brought about. "Programmed decisions" will fail to produce results. Students will be refused, residency requirements will be an obstacle, re-entry in the district will be difficult and disappointing. In these and other areas "creative decisions" will be necessary if the program is to be effective.

There will be disappointments for both organizations in the process. Even the most enthusiastic and committed people will be frustrated by their own bureaucracies as they attempt to respond to the needs of the other organization. If trust does not exist these disappointments will be magnified, and distrust and disillusionment will accelerate resulting in the abandonment of the cooperative effort. Again the personal committment of a few will be required as the difficult process of maintaining and nurturing of the relationship proceeds.

As and if the cooperative relationship grows both the school district and the university will find problems existing between themselves and other institutions with which organizational relationship must be maintained. Other universities will exhibit anger that they are not receiving the grant funds. Perhaps these same universities may have refused to cooperate with

the school district at an earlier time. Now, however, they see some advantage in such cooperation. Some forms of pressure will be brought on the school district to work with these here-to-fore uncooperative universities. If the new interest in cooperating is real this is a plus and should be capitalized upon for urban education can use all the help it can get. The initial cooperating university may feel abandoned as the school district builds relationships with other universities. In addition the cooperating university should be prepared for accusations that the cooperative program represents unprofessional compromises with the "standard" cannons of scholarship. The best that can be done is to be sure that such "informal gossip" is unfounded, for the gossip will surely occur and the criticism will surely take that form. As it reaches the home university the cooperative program will likely have to defend itself internally as well as externally. If the program cannot demonstrate its academic viability not only is the program in deep trouble, but, probably dead.

Joint University-School District Problems

The criteria for selection of program participants will differ among all interested sub-units of the cooperative program. The graduate school will perceive the standard and traditional requirement for admission as the only viable safeguard of academic quality. The school district, operating in truly gemienschaf or disiunctional bureaucratic fashion will perceive selection in the program as a "payoff" for jobs well done in the district regardless of intellectual ability. Between these polar positions rests a realistic compromise. Urban leadership will not be successful if it is not vigorous and political. The selected candidate should have demonstrated an ability to perform and be recognized by the power structure in the urban district. Additionally, urban leadership will bot be successful if it is not intellectually competent. The candidate must also be able to demonstrate

an ability to think and write conceptually and creatively. This does not mean that the successful candidate msut meet the highest possible standard formulated by those at both ends of the practice-scholarship continuum. It means that the candidate must demonstrate the ability to achieve acceptable success in both areas.

A second joint problem is the establishment of administrative internships for program fellows following their campus residency. Such internships are important. These internships should not be jobs. They should provide the opportunity for the intern to practice the theory he/she was exposed to in the residency. There should be the opportunity to get a broad view of the system, work under and with competent top echelon administrators attempting to solve important school district problems, and have the opportunity to demonstrate to top district decision-makers their adminstrative competence. This type of internship cannot be solved by the university alone. The establishment of such internships -- except for their place in the academic program and the residency preparation of the fellow for the internship -- is the sole province of the school district. For political reasons it is difficult for the school districts to meet this responsibility completely.

The re-entry of the fellows into the program is a complicated problem. Again the major responsibilty for the solving of this problem rests with the district and for the same political (and union contract) reasons they will not likely solve the problem completely. Fellows selected jointly by the district and university, who have sacrificed to participate and have been successful at the university will have professional aspirations considerably above those they formerly possessed. If re-entry is not carefully planned the urban district will lose sorely needed, trained and competent leadership. Specifically if the urban district cannot or will not provide enough leadership opportunities or if those provided are low

level opportunities without clear and rapid opportunities for advancement, program fellows will leave the district in order to find those opportunities.

Finally a goal of most cooperative school district-university programs is proported to be, and should be, to bring about meaningful and planned change in both institutions. One need not debate if all change or any and every change is good. Most can agree that some changes in urban education and universities would be helpful. Change is most quickly and easily accomplished on a charismatic, personal leadership basis. Structural, institutionalized change is much more difficult in both organizations. Some charismatic change will occur due to any urban district-university program. After the money and specifice leadership is gone, it is unlikely that institutionalized permanent change will remain. Some small amount of the change that had been or might have been will remain. Institutions can tolerate charismatic change that rests on individuals because the institution outlives the individual and most "others" outlive leaders, particularly change agents. Thus, institutions fight hardest for the status quo when confronted with structural, institutional change. But organizations, like people have memories and habitual responses that are imprinted due to experiences. The imprint of the cooperative program will remain and some change sill have occurred. Grand and global changes in institutions will not likely remain after the money and persons are gone, however. Such an expectation is unrealistic and an unlikely result.

Conclusion

What then of attempts of urban school districts and universities to cooperate in the training and utilization of education leadership? The prognosis is not good. But the difficult is not impossible. We do not believe that colleges of education can prosper without the inputs from

urban school districts, nor that urban schools can solve their problems without help and resources that exist in universities. The tribalistic regression into self-serving postures make such cooperative programs difficult. Yet some successes have occurred and these may expand upon. It is likely they will be operated upon individual committment and trust among a few from each organization. These people may meet frustration and disappointment, but the goal for which we strive is worth the effort.

The Selection and Training of Urban School Administrators

By

Eugene J. Richardson, Jr.

All racial minorities in the United States have been systematically restricted from administrative positions in public school districts. While Blacks and other racial minorities constitute a large percent of the urban school's population, the number of Blacks in administrative staffs is small by comparison. Nationwide, minorities account for 27 percent of the school population. The public school populations in the large urban areas are now over 50 percent non-white.

Minority group administrators are needed in the school systems for a number of reasons. Children of the minorities need to see adult members of their race in positions of power and authority. They need successful models from which to shape their lives and aspirations. When young people see that members of their group exercise power and control over their affairs it gives them a sense of purpose and motivation toward achievement. Coleman[1] found that of the three attitudes measured, sense of control over environment showed the strongest relationship to achievement.

Equality of opportunity means that minorities must have an equal chance to get administrative posts in the schools. The administrative staffs of urban school districts should reflect the racial and ethnic composition of the student bodies and the community.

Colleges usually admit students on the basis of the results of test of cognitive learning. This results in the exclusion from consideration of

potential students with personality attributes that will lead to success in academic as well as other fields. Holland[2] reported that the California Personality Inventory yielded predictive validity significantly superior to the Scholastic Aptitude test scores or grade point averages of National Merit Scholarship winners.

The Achiever Personality Scale constructed by Benno G. Frike[3] is a part of the empirically validated Opinion Attitude and Interest Survey. This scale measures personality associated with the usual criteria of academic success. People who score well on the Personality scale usually have equally high grade point averages in college and work up to their potential. Miller and O'Connor state,

> The personality Scale predicts college grades about as well as the typical academic ability test. Furthermore, scores from the Achiever Personality Scale do not correlate with scores from the ability tests. That is, the Scale measures something important in academic success not measured by ability test. In short, the Achiever Personality Scale is a good indicator of academic motivation and conscientiousness.

Personality scales can be used in selecting students from minority groups thereby avoiding the bias of the standard academic tests.

Grades are frequently used as a means of selection for advanced training programs. The rationale seems to be that those who have done well in the past will do well in the future. Taylor, Smith and Ghiselin[5] have shown that even for highly intellectual jobs like scientific researcher, superior on-the-job performance is related in no way to better grades in college. Berg,[6] in a book titled Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery, has summarized other studies which show that neither amount of education nor grades in school are related to vocational occupations.

The training of urban administrators can be accomplished in cooperation with a university. Special programs can be developed utilizing departments of educational administration and the broad course offerings of the other

colleges. Program participants can either spend full academic terms or summers only on campus if commuting is too time consuming. Other arrangements might be made where the professors travel to some convenient place within the school district. This arrangement would, of course, greatly reduce the available courses.

Besides the regualarly offered educational administration courses, urban school adminstrators should receive training in the behavioral sciences which provide a background that will give the administrator a more sophisticated view of schools, students and society. The urban school administrator must provide for a highly diverse and complex student body. He must in many instances conceive of and administer an organization that will not only help able young people learn but it must also motivate the inert and reform and redirect those students of culturally different backgrounds. This is a formidable task. Courses that deal with the psychology of learning, behavior modification and personality development are but a few that deal with the problem and will prove helpful.

The design and administration of programs of instructions can be better fitted to a community when one has first hand knowledge of the people, their style and their aspirations.. A training program for urban administrators should provide participants with experience in urban communities. Universities and school districts can establish cooperative relationships with stable community organizations with which program participants can be connected during the internship phase of their training.

Structured seminars are an effective means of integrating the thoughts of the educational administration courses and the behavioral sciences, and focusing them on the problems of urban schools. Professors of the various disciplines serve to stimulate and direct the discussions. Seminars also provide an opportunity for groups of participants to get together to

stimulate and reinforce each other and to discover each others' special interests. Seminars afford an opportunity for those administering the program to receive feedback from the participants.

The internship is an actualizing part of the training program and should occur in two phases. Phase one for a student would take place half way through his course work. This will enable the trainee to learn of and gain a feel for problem areas around which he can select future courses upon returning to the university. The second phase of the internship can occur at the end of the academic work as is usually the case.

Practicing administrators of proven ability, from principals on up, should be urged to accept interns for training. Interns should be placed in individual secondary schools as well as in other levels of the school organizations.

Some trainees may prefer working in areas of administration that do not deal directly with students. Job descriptions and the training requirements for the many positions in the administrative ranks should be available for the trainees. This will help to insure that the program participants receive the training needed for the areas in which they wish to work.

It is grossly wasteful of human and financial resources to establish a program to train individuals without planning for their utilization. To maximize the rate of utilization, upper level administrators in the school district should be made aware of the program, its design and expected output. The upper level administrators should receive profiles of the participants as they near the completion of their work. The personnel office should be fully involved and made every effort to place program graduates in administrative positions leading to greater degrees of responsibility. The program participants should be tapped into the pipe line of information about position openings. Program graduates should be encouraged to serve

on and be appointed to the various administrative and service committees, thus increasing their exposure, experience and contributions to the district.

NOTES

1. James S. Coleman, et al. Equality of Opportunity. (U.S. Office of Education, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966).

2. S.L. Holland. "The Prediction of College Grades from CPI and SAT." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1959, pp. 135-142.

3. B.G. Frike. OAIS Handbook, Ann Arbor, Michigan: OIAS Testing Program, 1965.

4. Doris M. Miller and Patricia O.Connor. "Achiever Personality and Academic Success Among Disadvantaged College Students." Journal of Social Issues, Summer, 1969, p. 105.

5. C. Taylor, W. R. Smith, and B. Ghiselin. "The Creative and Other Contributions of One Sample of Research Scientists." In C. W. Taylor and F. Barron (Eds.), Scientific Creativity: Its Recognition and Development. New York: Wiley, 1963.

6. Ivar Berg. Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery. New York: Praeger, 1970.

7. See Eugene J. Richardson Jr., "A Comparative Study of the Philadelphia Leadership Program For Inner-City School Administrators at the Pennsylvania State University," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), The Pennsylvania State University, 1973.

The Elementary School Administrator's Perspective

By

James E. Washington

The purpose of this section is to discuss through the elementary principal's perspective, the training and utilization of administrators for urban school systems. There is no suggestion that rural or urban school systems do not have particular needs unique to themselves, but because of the complexities of the urban systems there are certain needs.

Both rural and urban administrators will agree that the role of the elementary principal has undergone significant change during the last decade. For the urban elementary principal many factors have influenced that change. The few that may warrant mentioning are: the advent of teachers' unions and their demands for equal voice in many areas thought before to be solely the responsibility of the principal; the increased parental involvement in matters concerning the schools, and the constantly increasing need to adjust to the mobile urban school population. No longer is the principal viewed as the "captain of the ship" or "teacher of teachers," but as a facilitating manager who must like a baker, blend the various ingredients in order to get the perfect cake.

The training of administrators generally rests with the colleges and universities which have been authorized by their respective states to grant certification. The colleges have attempted to change their offerings in order to be more relevant to their clients. Even in their adjustment few schools differ in courses offered to prospective urban or rural principals. The uniqueness of each seems to dictate a difference in needs. While this

is not a negative reflection on university professors it is necessary to say that in general most have been removed from the schools they teach about, and their approach is more theoretical than practical.

The school systems are in a position of having to accept any individuals' credentials who has been trained in a state certifying school. It is possible, therefore, that an individual from a borough near Shickshinny, Pa. may end up, after a few years of teaching in Philadelphia or Pittsburgh, as an elementary school principal.

The urban school systems realize their needs for teachers and administrators, but are not authorized to prepare them. The colleges are authorized to certify students, but are not totally aware of the needs of the school systems. The meeting of the two functions would seem to satisfy the end of each and produce the desired outcome. It would seem that when the school systems can express their needs to the universities and colleges and they (universities and colleges) in turn can train and produce individuals to meet those needs, each separate system has fulfilled its goal.

While we realize the importance of the propoer training, it becomes a worthless excercise if the skills are not utilized. Imagine the quarterback who for four years has worked to becoming excellent in his position. He has become a pin-point passer, can change signals at the line of scrimmage, read defenses like a ten year professional and earns all-American honors. His work and training are for naught when he realizes that he hasn't been drafted after the final round. Therefore the training must be toward a purpose, and that purpose should be the utilization of acquired skills.

May I at this time refer to a program which features some of the facets already mentioned and the reference is made to the University-School system program conducted between Pennsylvania State University and the School System of Philadelphia, Pa.

The Philadelphia- Penn State Leadership Training program was one of five such programs in existence in the United States. The purpose of these programs was to select, prepare and return to the school systems qualified individuals in the area of educational administration. The planning of the program and the selection of the individuals was done jointly between the University and the school district. Although there was an expression by the school system that the courses offered be directed to particular problems of the urban system, the instruction was the responsibility of the university. Although the university made certain suggestions as to the place of program participants, placement and utilization was totally the responsibility of the school system.

A particular feature of the Philadelphia-Penn State leadership program was the internship to be served by the participants. Internship is not unique to this or the other school district university related programs, but it is not a requirement in many certifying universities.

While students of education are unable to receive certification until they have participated in a practicum period, it is possible in many instances for students of administration to become principals with serving an internship or practicum period. The internship segment of the program allowed the participant the opportunity to observe and become involved in administrative decisions and performances.

Utilization of administrators in the urban school system tends to depend heavily on the competition for available job slots. The difficulty faced by candidates for positions, whether program participants or not, is that training does not guarantee utilization. The testing procedure is equal to all candidated, therefore training serves only as an entry into the examination. The university-school system program had as its' goal

the establishment of a cadre of individuals prepared to handle the various complex problems unique to the urban schools. As alluded to previously the utilization and training processes are not jointly done. This should no be considered an attack on the school system, because it must be realized that there can be no policy which, accepts, the products of one university, and exclude the products of others, or even show favoritism to one.

The suggestion would appear to be a collective agreement between the urban school systems and the certifying universities and colleges. The schools (universities and colleges) must gain a better understanding of the needs of the school systems, and in order to do that there must be continued communication. The school systems must realistically evaluate themselves to determine real goals and objectives. To reach this realization it is apparently necessary to solicit the views, opinion and involvement of the community.

There must be clear lines drawn to separate the role of the training institutions, and of the school systems. The institutions should because of the role it has have complete control over the training aspect, but not without being aware of what the training is for. The realization that school systems have the right to establish procedures for utilizing trained individuals is firm. Through the cooperative approach at least school systems will be aware of how the candidate has been prepared. There is little satisfaction in being the best trained harmonica player in the New York Symphony.

Training and Utilization of Administrators For Urban School Systems

By

William Ross, Jr.

A District Superintendent's Perspective

The turbulence and social unrest which characterized the late 60's signalled the advent of a new era and preponderous changes the the public schools of our country.

This was especially true in the urban centers. The school administrator had traditionally been viewed as the master teacher, the instructional leader, the answer to every problem that might arise.

Schools had traditionally existed, aloof, almost in isolation and oblivious of the clientele they purported to serve. Citizens in the city stood in awe of the school. They were expected to comply and accept passively whatever the school chose to do. Rarely did a citizen dare challenge the schools on its routines, its pronouncements, or its response to parental requests.

The rise of teacher militancy and unionization - the expectations built up by civil rights - the disillusionment of parents with pupil achievement in the basic skills - put the urban administrator in a new light. In fact, the cry came from the communities that if you are not relevant to our needs, you must go. Everyone was caught. Many schools of administration had not really noticed the sleeping giant that had sprung its weary head. In some instances, the curriculum had not changed for years.

The courses in school finance spent too much time on federal or state finance of school systems and not enough on the political forces that hold the purse strings on education. The course in school law did not prepare

the administrator for those surprise happenings which might occur at any time in an urban school setting which might throw him in the middle of a big law suit, and, the last example that I might cite would be the lack of systems to prepare the urban administrator with the skills necessary for coping with various problems that are confronted daily in large districts.

As a District Superintendent in a large urban setting with 42,000 pupils from kindergarten to grade 12, my job is endless. I must direct the improvement of the instructional skills through strong motivation, and educational leadership of principals. I must introduce new educational models consistent with current population needs and interests. I must articulate within the district the various educational components in order to assure continuity in the flow of the educational process. I must assume a major role with community agencies to promote understanding of and involvement in the educational decisions. I must set district goals and objectives that support and are consonant with overall school district policy. I must monitor all resources allocated to the district and, above all, among other things, see that the administrators have the sufficient tolls to do the job that they are supposed to have in order to reach the educational expectations that all of us want.

Our administrators in urban school systems need detailed study in the area of human relations, negotiations, budgeting and finance, social services, resources, recent national state and local school law information and, etailed work in systems analysis, if they are to survive on the urban scene.

I, persoanlly, would like to advocate what I call the medical model of training for an administrator in the urban setting. Like the medical doctor, the administrator in training should get a dose of what it is like with a seasoned practitioner or clients who have educational needs. He should be directly involved with solving or mediating parental complaints, handling disruptive students, in-service education and staff development for teachers,

have a knowledge of problems of school facilities, be able to handle school accounts, know how to observe the instructional process, and be well versed in new programs. The urban administrator should possess the knowledge of how to interpret the data from research in order to effectively plan with his constituents a balanced program based on the findings.

I mentioned earlier that the urban school administrator should possess those skills necessary that are needed in large school districts to cope with, and handle problems peculiar to his environment and situation. The problems in society become problems of the school. Somehow, the administrator must be emotionally stable, be able to control his anxiety, be determined and aggressive, be persistent and at times tenacious, and, above all, possess professional integrity. If, on some days, he finds that most of his time is spent on problems of student conflict, unreasonable parents, the problem of narcotics, child abuse and neglect, teacher apathy, or central office bureaucracy - he must develop the art of managing himself effectively. Unless he does this, no amount of ability, skill, experience, or knowledge will make him an effective administrator in today's urban setting.

It is a major responsibility, then, of the District Superintendent to utilize the talents and strengths of the urban administrators in his charge in order to effectively make a change in the district to improve the quality of life for all of the constituents that reside therein.

If we are to provide quality education, and meet not only the current needs, but the changing needs - the skills mentioned in this paper must be acquired by the urban administrator in the bi-centennial years of our country.

Another District Superintendents' Perspective

By

William H. Harris

Introduction

The population size of the large cities has diminished during the past twenty years. The composition of that population, however, has undergone significant changes. The in migrations have been largely poor, black and Puerto Rican. The out migration has been affluent and white. A dwindling tax base and the increased resistance of tax payers to spiraling budgets have resulted in a rash of rejected school bond issues. Paralleling this phenomenon has been the civil rights movements, the growth of teacher militancy and student protest. Newcomers to urban America, influenced by this activism have in increasing numbers begun to look at their schools. They have contended that the schools are not sensitive to the needs of their children.

Historically, the urban school and its community have been ideologically close. It has always, according to Fantini and Weinstein,[1] called itself the great homogenizer. It has taken great masses of diverse people and acculturated them to the middle class mainstream. Phenix,[2] in relating the school to the community, explained that the school did not exist for its own sake nor for the benefit of any special group or class within society but existed to serve the many and varied groups and individuals that together made up the community.

A number of current writers, however, insist that the present urban school is failing or has failed in that task and that the ideological distance between what the school does on the one hand and what its clients need on the other has broadened.

In a recent study of urban school problems, Fantini and Weinstein have

concluded that the acculturation process is no longer working. The urban school no longer seems capable in its present state to transport lower class masses to the middle class mainstream. In fact, they insist that an opposite result is occurring. Many of the processes established by the schools are intended to stamp out diversity, both cultural and individual, so that the urban school actually alienates diverse pupils and keeps them disconnected from school. Spain, discussing the same problem as it affects the local school administrator, states that the gradual separation of the school from its community has provided a fertile field for critics and enemies.

Jacobsen, et al [4] have also noted the growing separation of school and community and the subsequent exploitation of that separation. The attacks have been primarily of two kinds: (1) Those who believe sincerely that the school is doing a poor job and should be improved and (2) attacks that are malicious in character. The former is caused by lack of understanding of what the school is doing, by poor school-community relations and unsound financial operations. The latter is caused by persons seeking tax reductions, those desiring publicity and opponents of public education.

Contemporary observers of the urban educational scene have listed several factors contributing to the school-community conflict. Fantini and Weinstein[5] have said that the out migration of upper and middle class families from the cities have left the public schools in those cities the habitat of the socio-economically disadvantaged. This trend has helped produce the conflict. The schools have been unable or unwilling to meet the needs of its new clients and to adjust themselves to a changed milieu. Fantini and Weinstein characterize the urban milieu thusly:

> "The urban school has attempted to shy away from things going on in the real world which are part of an urban child's experience. Thus there is a dichotomy and tension between the child's urban curriculum and the school's more antiseptic curriculum -- a dichotomy that usually leads the urban child

to label the schools curriculum as phony."[6]

Charles E. Stewart, et al[7] in examining the problem of urban administrators, conclude that disadvantaged people tend to be action seekers and carry a constant sense of anxiety.

The Field Administrator and The Community

The sheer size of large urban school districts make necessary a wide span of administrative control. The Superintendent in such districts handles the delegation of authority through a system of administrative levels. The levels begin with the superintendent and extend downward to the classroom teacher. In general the larger the school system the greater the number of administrative layers. Thus we find deputy superintendents, associate or assistant superintendents, field or district superintendents and so on. The field or district superintendent, unlike others in the upper administrative layers, is usually housed or stationed in the district over which he administers. He is, as the name implies, the field representative of the superintendent of schools. The changing role of the district superintendent and other field administrators and the new expectation upon that role holds significance for the training and utilization of administrators for urban school systems.

The District Superintendent and staff exists primarily for service and support to district schools and their staffs, for educational leadership in the broadest sense and for liaison between central administration and the field. Their duties and responsibilities vary from locale to locale but generally include most or all of the following:

1. Responsibility and accountability for decisions involving the instructional program, district personnel, the budget, pupil services and community relations.

2. Membership in the school superintendent's cabinet.

3. Leadership in planning and coordinating district wide programs.

4. Participation in the selection of principals and other district personnel.

5. Appraisal and evaluation of the performance of principals and other district administrative personnel.

6. Appearances before the Board.

7. Direct community involvement.

8. Expenditure and accounting of petty cash funds.

9. Liaison between the field and central administration.

Local urban communities continue to demand a direct input in the running of their schools. The direct (action) protests that characterized this concern in the past decade have abated somewhat but parents still "shop" for quality schools, are concerned about budget items, demand removal of unresponsive principals and teachers and urgae curriculum changes. These demands and concerns are visited upon the local school and principal but in increasing number are being depositied at the door of the District Superintendent.

Parents and community persons rely heavily upon line and staff charts in determining who in the school bureaucracy has the power to adjust a remedy. Unfortunately such charts do little to explain the dynamics of real power in an organization such as a large system. While they are useful in setting forth the physical position of a role incumbent and as a kind of map to quide those who seek to "work through channels," they fail to delineate or explain fully the true flow of power or where decisions are made. Those whom the schools serve and who have legitimate concerns mistakenly made many of their demands upon a District Superintendent or principal who may no longer be in a position to act upon them.

Alvin W. Gouldner in his book, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy,[8] describes the twilight of middle management. He discusses the encroachments made upon middle management perogatives and power by unions. The growth of

teacher unions and influence in the running of urban schools is well documented. Teacher contracts have carved deep inroads into the areas that were once deemed sacred to administration. While union contracts have affected upper or central office management, they have most directly modified the perogatives of principals and district superintendents. School boards and their neotitiating teams have domonstrated a remarkable affinity for contracting away the domain of their field administrators. Teacher unions now have a direct say in the assignment of teachers, transfers, working hours, committees, duties and relationships with students and administrators.

In addition principals, supervisors and other first line administrators have organized themselves (in many urban communities)into union type organizations. They have negotiated contracts with school boards that carefully spell out their relationship with the district superintendent and central administration. Such contracts, when they exist give principals rights that further curb the perogatives of their superordinates. Thus the district superintnendent is becoming the managerial cutting edge. In that respect he is replacing the principal, who is beginning to unionize.

Field administration at both the principal and District Superintendent level, continues to bear the major responsibility for pupil, parent and community pressure. Urban central office administration, on the other hand, has demonstrated scant enthusiasm for a decentralization of power and decision making to the field. Matters of the budget, salaries of personnel, allotment of personnel, curriculum and the like are decided at the central office with certain union contractual inputs.

In the area of pupil services, a series of court decisions, stimulated by community and student advocates, have curtailed the power of field administration in certain pupil personnel areas. Many of the decisions

affecting student transfers, suspensions, expulsions, drops etc. are no longer the judgments of school men, but have been mandated by the courts. The courts have invaded the hollowed sanctuary of the school-client relationship, forcing revisions in pupil policies. District Superintendents may no longer assign pupils at will or transfer pupils at will. Principals may no longer suspend or expell without a court prescribed due process.

These forces impinging upon the perogatives of urban administrators affect appreciably the manner in which they deal with their role prescriptions. Institutions concerned with the training of urban administrators and school district utilizing them must take these new as well as the old constraints into consideration.

Institutions training perspective administrators for careers on urban education must develop training models that will take into full measure the pluralistic power sources that run large and complex school systems. These models should consider among others the following:

1. The demographic changes in urban communities.
2. The dwindling tax base and the reluctance of local, state and federal legislature bodies to "bail out" urban systems.
3. The informational and communication gap between the school and its clientele.
4. The increasing power of teacher unions.
5. The tendency of middle school management (principals and supervisors) to organize and to separate themselves from upper administration or management.
6. The entry of courts into school decision making.

School districts in their utilization of administrators trained in such precepts would be well served to:

1. Join training institutions in setting up responsive and

. adequate training models.

2. Provide internships that implement training institution programs.

3. Give high priority to the narrowing of the community information gap.

4. Heal the breach between middle and upper management.

5. Utilize administrators versed in the training model.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Drummond, Harold, John Goodlad, and Charles Spain. Educational Leadership and the School Principal. New York: Rinehart and Comapny, Inc., 1969.

Fantini, Mario, Marilyn Gittell, and Richard Magat. Community Control and the Urban School. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

_____, and Gerald Weinstein. Making Urban Schools Work. (New York: Praeger Publisher, 1969).

Gouldner, Alvin W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1954.

Jacobsen, Paul B., James D. Logsdon, and William E. Reavis. The Effective School Principal. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentiss-Hall Book Company, 1963.

Phenix, Philip H. Philosophy of Education. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1958.

Alternative Program Administrator's Perspective

By

Robert C. Hutchins

Large urban school systems are faced with a tremendous challenge to provide appropriate learning experiences and increased educational opportunities for the various life styles of students living in the innercity. Students who are caught up in a society that is rapidly changing, both socially and technically. The educator in the urban school system finds himself faced with increasingly difficult conditions under which he has to do his job. Crowded classrooms, limited facilities, shortage of supplies, disruptive students, and austerity budgets all stand between the educator and his task.

A growing number of educational leaders of urban school systems are increasingly aware that schools, as they exist today, are failing to meet the needs of a vast portion of the school population. Federal and state legislatures, school boards, universities, educators, and community and civic groups have sought and are still seeking solutions to the problems of urban education. This search for solutions has led many urban school systems to explore the role of alternative schools as a possible solution to some of the problems, (motivation, curriculum, crowd control, scheduling, disruptive behavior, and economics) which plague so many urban schools. Innovative alternative schools within the public sector have been in operation for a short period of time in Chicago, Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore, Berkeley, Dallas, and many other cities that are too numerous to list. The trend toward alternative schools has captured the attention of educators across the nation.

If these alternative schools are to prove useful as viable educational models, then a training or retraining program for leadership of these schools

must emerge. New models of administrators don't spring, like Athena out of Zeus" head, they must be developed.

Leadership programs must address themselves to the task of developing trained individuals who can administer alternative schools and made them a viable promise that offers fundamental improvement of learning and opportunity for many urban school children who need the skills, motivation, and broad based experiences necessary for success in life beyond high school. A Gallup Poll conducted in 1973 reflected support for the idea of alternative schools by both lay people and professional educators (62 per cent of parents, 80 percent of professionals indicated that it was a good idea.)

As alternative schools continue to develop (their numbers are growing at a rapid rate), and as the nature and scope of alternatives within the public school sector begin to expand, a rather unique need will be created for training programs in order to develop competent leaders for these schools.

I would like to present some ideas that I believe are relevant to the task of leadership training for alternative schools. In one part, they have been developed from the varied array of literature addressing the alternative school movement. In another part, they are merely my own humble views on desirable directions that the leadership development process should take.

Based on an examination of the literature, including the November issue of Educational Leadership: The Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1974) devoted to alternative educational programs, it would seem appropriate to say that programs for the purpose of preparing administrators for alternative schools, to a noticeable degree, have yet to emerge on university campuses.

Without belaboring the point, it appears safe to say that administrators will need to be trained in increasing numbers if alternative schools are to

continued as models of education change for urban school systems. In order to insure that more schools of choice develop within the public sector, urban school districts will need to move to increase their dialogue with universities that train educational leaders. Urban school systems will need to provide clear and concise statements of programmatice school system goals to the university so that both the trainee and the university are aware of leadership needs.

The leadership training and development process should clearly be a major concern of both the university and the school system. If special educational problems exist in an urban school system that an alternative school might solve, then special leadership training programs must be established at the university that eventually will lead at least in part, to the resolution of those problems.

The selection process, whether done by the university or by the school district, or jointly, should be directly related to the resolution of a specific educational problem existing within the school district. Both the university and the school district must be guided in the selection by an assessment of the trainee's understanding of his or her committment to the resolution of a specific educational problems through the acquisition of certain skills, the mastering of certain knowledge, and a willingness to explore certain attitudes important to the development of the studnets who will eventually come under the influence of that individual's leadership.

The school system must, in turn, clearly articulate to both the trainee and the university a willingness to utilize in a new and meaningful way the trainee's knowledge, understanding, and competencies in order to solve or help resolve existing educational problems within the school system. Those trained for administrative roles in alternative schools must be afforded the opportunity to become change agents and make important contributions that make a difference in a positive way.

Properly trained alternative school administrators emerging from the university, after their training or retraining, must be made visible to the school system. One method of assuring the visibility of a trainee is that of providing the trainee an opportunity to serve an alternative school internship and have a case study experience. The internship should be adequately funded and supported by both the university and school district. Universities will profit from the clinical setting and the school system will have the advantage of determining a precise assessment of the trainee's developing skills, understandings and learning theories that can be directly related to the resolution of a jointly identified school district problem.

If alternative schools are to play an important role in solving urban educational problems, a plan must be designed for the leadership training and development of administrators for these schools. Any plan that begins to address the very serious problems that are abundant in urban school systems should be jointly constructed by both the university and the school district. Any plan for the training and utilization of administrators for alternative programs and schools must have a well thought out selection process, training component and utilization committment. Alternative schools seem likely to suffer from acute growing pains, and without adequate and effective training for leadership for these schools, we are apt to wind up like Columbus. We don't know where we are going, and most assuredly, we won't know where we are when we get there.

REFERENCES

1. Educational Leadership: Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 32 (2); November 1974.

2. Fantini, Mario D. Public Schools of Choice. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1974.

3. Fifth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education Phi Delta Kappan 55 (1): 43; September, 1973.

A Central Office Prospective

By

Lionel Lauer

In order to view this program from the perspective of the School District of Philadelphia, one must examine the setting in which the program began.

A first consideration is that it was initiated by the school district itself in response to an assessment of need relating to political issues of the day. Student unrest, racial confrontation, under-represented minority leadership in the schools and administration, decentralization and others forced the district to scrap heretofore inviolate procedures in order to open up the system.

One approach was the use of a provision of the educational home rule charter that allowed the superintendent to select up to 5 % of his total staff without employing the traditional examination process. A number of such appointments were made as vice principals in secondary schools. All such action was subject to board approval of course and was to later be known simply as "5% appointments." Pennsylvania State University made sincere overtures to deliver certification programs to many of the abovr, who incidentally were predominately Black and not holders of the required principals certificates. Several accepted such a program and an empathetic relationship between two institutions took hold.

Going on at the same time was the detailed study of the vice principal's position through a joint committee of administration and the Philadelphia Association of School Administrators. It was recommended that a position of vice principal be established in the elementary school and present holders

of that position be required to secure an elementary principal's certificate. Still another pool of personnel was needed whose training would meet a rather high need.

The EPDA based program that was to grow from a proposal that had its roots in these causes, attempted to install several features in its initial structure.

Through a Policy and Selection Committee, one comprised of the Superintendent's cabinet and leading university staff, selection of personnel for the program was governed by the notion that a pool of eligibles be trained in areas of administration where needs appeared to be emerging within a five year period. Initially the two major groups in the program were vice-principals striving for certification and principals and central office personnel working on the Ed.D. or Ph. D. Those candidates not in administration at the time, were afforded a three month administrative internship with the though that this was an approach to broadening their administrative internship with the thought that this was an praoch to broadening their administrative background and also displaying the products of the program to key district and central office leadership.

This historical development of our perspective must also call to mind the sudden shift of conditions in Washington in the late 60's and early 70's. Sources of funds that appeared to be dependable dried up and with them an expanding school district, in terms of personnel to meet the leadership needs of newly designed programs, became instead a system that struggled to stay open from one contract negotiating period to the next.

As our program's first wave of trainees completed their requirements, the perceived follow-through support system didn't produce for the participant what had been by him as the logical next step; that of a promotional opportunity.

Instead the school district by action said to the candidates, "to a great extent, you're on your own. This is as far as this program can take you promotionally. If your training is sound you can compete equally with graduates of more traditional programs." And They Have.

However, as the song once said, "I never promised you a rose garden" neither did the school district see all graduates moving to the superintendency of a system or district within a 3 year period. Rather, if interest in producing system-wide change, for the improvement of opportunities for children still exists then this new found pool of expertise will apply their skills for the renewal of our school district on a school by school basis. We must at least light one little candle.

This program has been responsible for providing the certification requirements to 50 people now on the job in vice-principalships in our secondary schools and/or administrative assistants in the elementary schools. There are now or soon to be 20 people who have been awarded their doctoral degree: several directors, assistant directors, principals, a university dean, key person with OIC and assistants to district superintendents among them.

The pool of leadership from which to draw still abounds with people possessing training, creativity and drive. In an effort to continue to draw attention to the potential of such people two additional features have been installed this year. Doctoral program members have developed five teams and are producing research and position papers in areas that reflect the superintendnet's goals and priorities for the eventual use of upper administration in dealing with the issues so reviewed.

As you might perceive, such a pool of skilled personnel are sought after by other districts and institutions and several have gone on to become regional or national leaders. Recogninzing vast room for more sensitive

support and development of individuals the individuals the school district must from the perspective of considering the original needs for first implementing such a program, consider the Penna. State/School District of Philadelphia leadership training effort one most worthwhile and one that will deliver dividends for many years to come.

The Insider Looking Out

By

William L. Garberina

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to describe the process facing a student in a university-school district educational leadership program when he decides not to return to the sponsoring school district upon completing his residencey at the university. In an attempt to develop a conceptual perspective of these events, the author will draw upon Carlson's notion of 'place bound' and career bound' superintendents and apply it to the student process.

The Perspective

Essentially Carlson concludes that individuals striving to enhance their careers move through two general patterns. The individual who wishes to improve his status by working and remaining loyal to one organization is 'place bound' in his orientation. This individual perceives his advancement through the intimate knowlege of the workings of the organization and years of formal and informal contacts within it.

The 'career bound' person who whishes to improve his status sees advancement through an overall commitment to his profession, attendance at conferences to keep abreast of professional developments at the national level, improvement of his profession through research and so forth. Although the 'career bound' pattern seems more ideal than the 'place bound' pattern, it has the same goals; status enhancement and recognition.

The Cask of Amantillado or Walking You In

When the author was chosen as a fellow in the Pennsylvania State University - Philadelphia School District Leadership Program, he was basically 'place bound' in his career pattern. After serving five years as an elementary teacher, he became the administrative assistant to the elementary principal in the same school. The position of administrative assistant is a lateral career movement in Philadelphia which can serve as a stepping stone to the principalship. Also, it becames the administrative burial ground for many individuals.

The author had no intentions or working in a district other than Philadelphia. As with other large school systems, Philadelphia offers many opportunities for advancement. Administrative positions abound throughout the school district; one can become a building administrator, or work in one of the eight district offices, or obtain a position in central administration. Moreover, numerous staff positions at various levels of responsibility are opened for application each year. To enhance a 'place bound' career orientation, the Philadelphia School System offers attractive salary schedules for its professional personnel. At any given salary level, the city surpasses the surrounding districts in monetary rewards. This, of course, is a major factor in an individual's decision to stay in the system and 'wait for a break.'

There are some drawbacks to working in a large bureaucracy, and the Philadelphia School District also exemplifies these factors. Many individuals apply for the above mentioned positions. To qualify for the list, written and oral tests are generally given. If an individual passes these hurdles, he is placed on a list that usually has a one or two year duration. After appointments are filled from the list, the other individuals are chosen as people move, transfer, or retire. If a person's name is not reached on the list, or he fails to qualify for it, he must wait until the test is given again.

The author viewed the Penn State-Philadelphia Leadership Program from a 'place bound' perspective when he was accepted. He viewed the doctorate as a form of mental GASSING. There would not be that many individuals applying for a principalship who had a doctorate. This would improve the author's chances substantially. Also, the doctorate would probably give him the opportunity to qualify for positions in the district offices and central administration. Finally, since the school that would last three years, there would probably be special consideration given to the individuals in the program. With this 'place bound' orientation the author embarked on a year of residency at Pennsylvania State University.

The Battle of Jericho

After the first few months of residency at Penn State, the author discovered that the other eight members in his group had basically the same aspirations. The doctorate would serve as a means to speed the provess of entering administration. However, two unique features of being a fellow in the program served to start the change of the author's perspective to 'career bound.'!

Seminars were held once a week by the co-directors of the program. This enabled the author to share not only his academic experience with the fellows in the program, but to talk about similar professional problems in the city school system. As his conceptual basis of administrative problems grew, the author began to view administrative decision-making, not only in terms of solving the day-to-day problems, but placing even routine decisions in a larger framework of policy procedure and social system's analysis. These factors broadened his horizons of possible alternatives to administrative decision-making.

At the same time the fellows in the program began to discuss these issues in the same light. The seminars became an arena for the discussion

of conceptual solutions to problems, and the ways to apply these solutions in practice. The academic experience was a stimulating and rewarding one, above the 'place bound' perspective it originally offered. The author came to a belief that the reason administrators shy away from hard decision-making to solve problems stems from the fact that they have 'place bound' perspectives. If one views his career as unalterably tied to one organization, his loyalty to that organization will overwhelm other considerations in the solutions to problems. Maintenance of the status quo is the by-word for 'place-bound' decision-makers.

The other feature of the program was the encouragement by the co-directors to write and give professional papers at national conferences, either individually or as part of a symposium. The author became involved in this portion of the program and was exposed to professional opinions from all sections of the country. This experiece broadened his perspective concerning educational advancement outside of Philadelphia.

The program at Penn State also gave the author the opportunity to interact with administrators from across the state. The author shared ideas with rurual, suburban, and middle sized city administrators. He quickly had the myth destroyed that the only place where the real educational challenbe lies is in a large, multi-racial, multi-ethnic school system. The challenge is not the only one, it is simply a different one.

During the final term of his residency in the summer of 1973 the author returned to Philadelphia to apply for two positions, the principalship and administrative assistant. Although he failed to make the list of principals, the author did secure a position as an administrative assistant.

The Walls Came Tumbling Down

Somewhat frustrated with himself at not reaching the principal's list he applied for principalship in districts around the state. He received one

in a district close to the university. This appointment put him under cross-pressure.

He was, naturally, happy to become a principal. On the other hand, the Philadelphia School District had invested time, money, and other expense to train him in educational administration. This problem was coupled with another anxiety. Although his residency was completed, the author would have entered an internship upon his return to Philadelphia. This would have placed him, for at least six months, in an upper administrative level in the school district. He would have had an opportunity to view the district process at a higher level before returning to work in a school building. This, of course, was an opportunity not easily discarded.

The final decision, based on a career orientation, developed after his experience at the university. It enabled the author to embark on a career pattern that he was not considering before his admittance to the program. It should be noted that the training received at Penn State, although geared specifically to urban education, was broad enough to provide the author with the prequisite skills to work in a rural principalship.

Summary

By

Frank W. Lutz

The above positions reflect several prospectives of our university-urban district cooperative leadership program. These include students now holding positions of : a high school assistant principal, one elementary principal and an assistant principal, one administrative assistant to the district superintendent, a special program director, and one who left the district now returned and one who returned to the district but has now left, have expressed their views. In addition the central offices director of staff leadership and the university's co-directors present their perspective as well as a district superintendent who worked with many of the students as administrative interns and selected several as administrators in his district. All agree on the overall general success of the program. This conclusion of course, could be spurious - they are all our friends and co-participants. We the project failed each in part had a hand in the failure and of course if it is a success they, to large measure, each contributed to that success. But there are other criteria to evaluate the success. Seventeen persons in the program have finished doctoral programs. At least ten more will complete in the near future and of the forty-five who have been or are in the doctoral program another five to ten will probably complete. This is a good record. Of the approximately 150 in the various phases only nine had to be dropped without achieving either degree or principal certification. This is an outstanding achievement. As pointed out in Lauer's section most individuals have bettered their personal-professional situation. This is a good record.

There have been problems however. These are pointed to through out the papers. They include:

1. Lack of organizational or institutional committment (either university or school district) in the perception of money.

2. This leads to the notion that such programs rest upon the individual committment of a few in each organiation. This was the consensus of 100 % of the five directors of city-university programs funded by EPDA at a recent meeting in Detroit.

3. While generalized leadership training is necessary, leadership for solving specific proglems is also useful. The first step in this process is identification of problems and ordering in priority. If individuals having some skills are then identified and the skills additionally needed specified university-city projects would be more meaningful. University courses, internships and research could then be directed at solving specific school district problems and returing fellows could be placed in strategical positions in terms of the problem solving plan developed by the district and the university. If correctly handled, outside funds might be secured to assist in the problem solving either in terms of research and demonstration grant.

   The failure to even establish much less accomplish this process was the major failure of our project. There are many reasons but in my view the major reason was the refusal of the school district to cooperate, even in terms of problem identification, toward which training might be directed.

4. In summary, the evaluation report of 1972, the brief report of 1974 and an addendum to the current status of students where applicable is attached to this paper.